

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-20 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,632,651 to Szegda.

Regarding Claim 1, the examiner states that Szegda includes “. . . at least one protrusion (50a-b) formed thereon partially encircling the locking sleeve (26)”

It is respectfully submitted that shoulders 50a and 50b, shown and described in Szegda, are radial and fully encircle locking sleeve 26. The specification of Szegda makes clear numerous times that shoulders 50a and 50b are “first and second axially spaced radially protruding circular shoulders . . .” (See Column 4, Lines 19-20) that “. . . protrude from the surface of the locking member by a radial distance . . .” (See Column 4: Lines 25-26). Szegda clearly teaches the prior art of an uninterrupted, annular ring that encircles the outer portion of the locking sleeve as described in the Background of the Invention of the present application. The element of Claim 1 requiring “at least one protrusion formed thereon partially encircling the locking sleeve” is simply not taught, shown or suggested in the Szegda art cited by the examiner.

Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1 and provide further limitations. It is axiomatic that if the broader independent claim is not anticipated or made obvious in light of the prior art, then neither are the dependent claims that append therefrom.

In reference to Claim 11, the examiner states that Szegda discloses “. . . a locking sleeve (26) detachably coupled to the connector body (22) having a plurality of evenly spaced

protrusions (50a-b) formed thereon”

Claim 11 has been amended herein to state that the protrusions are evenly spaced in radial separation about the locking sleeve of the connector. The protrusions (50a-b) of Szegda are contiguous rings formed about the locking sleeve (26). The protrusions (50a-b) are axially spaced along the locking sleeve (26). Protrusions are not evenly spaced in radial fashion about the locking sleeve (26). The element of Claim 11, as amended, requiring “a plurality of protrusions, spaced radially and evenly,” is simply not taught, shown or suggested in the Szegda art cited by the examiner.

Claims 12-16 depend from Claim 11 and provide further limitations. It is axiomatic that if the broader independent claim is not anticipated or made obvious in light of the prior art, then neither are the dependent claims that append therefrom.

Regarding Claim 17, the examiner states that Szegda discloses “. . . a connector body (26) having a cable receiving end (shown in Fig. 4) and a projection (50a-b) disposed therein, a locking sleeve (22) coupled to the connector body (26) and having a rearward end (shown in Fig. 4), a smooth annular portion (34) and at least one groove (52) formed between the rearward end (shown in Fig. 4) and the smooth annular portion (34); and wherein the projection (50a-b) slides along the smooth annular portion (34) and is subsequently received in the groove (52) when the coaxial cable (12) is terminated in the connector body (26)”

It is respectfully submitted that the examiner has swapped connector parts and interchanged part numbers on different parts to formulate the anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). For instance, Szegda does not teach, show or suggest the use of a projection on

the connector body (22). The inner portion of connector body (22) is smooth-walled apart from groove (52) for receiving annular rings (50a-b) that are disposed on locking sleeve (26). The examiner, however, refers to (26) as the connector body and (22) as the locking sleeve. The actual connector body (22) of Szegda does not have a protrusion disposed therein for seating within a groove on the actual locking sleeve (26). The examiner cannot label parts of a reference by different names with different functions than what is taught or shown in the reference. Here, Szegda does not teach, show or suggest the use of the plastic locking sleeve (26) as a connector body, nor does it teach, show or suggest use of the metal connector body (22) as a locking sleeve. The connector of Szegda would simply not function if these two components were somehow reversed.

Claims 18-20 depend from Claim 17 and provide further limitations. It is axiomatic that if the broader independent claim is not anticipated or made obvious in light of the prior art, then neither are the dependent claims that append therefrom.

Upon entrance of this amendment, claims 1-20 remain in the application. Claim 11 has been amended. No new claims have been added.

The Office Action of March 10, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that the present Response traverses or overcomes all bases of rejection, the Application is now in suitable form for allowance, and the claims as set forth are not anticipated by the Szegda reference cited by the examiner.

The examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number below if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas & Betts International, Inc.



G. Andrew Barger
Reg. No. 39,899
Customer No.: 27361

c/o G. Andrew Barger, Esq.
THOMAS & BETTS CORPORATION
Legal Department 4B-36
8155 T&B Boulevard
Memphis, Tennessee 38125

A/C (901) 252-5648

In the Drawings

No changes have been required to the drawings by the examiner.